



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,836	07/22/2003	Vibhas Pandey	56.0696	6576
27452 7590 05/26/2010 SCHLUMBERGER TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION David Cate IP DEPT., WELL STIMULATION 110 SCHLUMBERGER DRIVE, MD1 SUGAR LAND, TX 77478				
EXAMINER TRAN, TUYETLEEN T				
ART UNIT 2179		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 05/26/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PMohan@exchange.slb.com
KYzaguirre@exchange.slb.com
KJohnson18@exchange.slb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/624,836

Applicant(s)

PANDEY, VIBHAS

Examiner

TUYETLIEN T. TRAN

Art Unit

2179

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18, 19, 37, 38, 56 and 57 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 20-36 and 39-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed 04/12/2010.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 18-19, 37-38, 56-57 are withdrawn from consideration due to un-elected group. Claims 1-17, 20-36, 39-55 are elected for examination. Claims 1, 20 and 39 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. **Claims 1, 5, 20, 24, 39, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Randall (Patent No. 5237651; hereinafter Randall).**

As to claims 1, 20, and 39, Randall teaches:

A program storage device readable (e.g., memory means, see col. 4 lines 26-28) by a machine tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine (e.g., see Fig. 1) to perform method steps for determining data (e.g., an electronic personal organizer that has instructions on how to performed the task of organizing data such as phone, memo, see Fig. 1 and Fig. 3), said method steps comprising:

(a) displaying a handbook on a display screen of said machine, said handbook including a left page, a right page, and at least one binder ring interconnecting the left page to the right

page (e.g., see Fig. 3a and col. 3 lines 19-26, col. 4 lines 21-26, lines 64-66; book representational graphics which is displayed by the display means of the device);

(b) displaying a page in said handbook on said display screen of said machine in response to an input instruction (e.g., see col. 6 lines 52-67 and col. 7 lines 7-20; the selected page is displayed in response to the user input); and

(c) determining said data from said page in said handbook being displayed on said display screen of said machine in response to a set of input data and a further set of data stored in a database (e.g., see col. 7 lines 8-33 and Fig. 5; upon the user touching the indexing tab, corresponding section will be accessed and displayed), said data determined during the determining step (c) being displayed on said display screen of said machine (e.g., see col. 7 lines 8-33 and Fig. 5; corresponding section will be accessed and displayed).

As to claims 5, 24, and 43, Randall further teaches enabling a search window on said computer display screen (e.g., search window for name and associating telephone number, see Fig. 5); entering search parameters in said search window (e.g., selecting 'AB' button on the right of the page); and displaying said data in response to the step of entering said search parameters (e.g., displaying names and associating telephones that are in the range of 'AB').

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the

international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 5, 20, 24, 39, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (No. US 20040039750 A1; hereinafter Anderson).

As to claims 1, 20, and 39, Anderson teaches:

A program storage device readable by a machine tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform method steps for determining data (e.g., see Fig. 1 and [0036]), said method steps comprising:

(a) displaying a handbook on a display screen of said machine (e.g., see Fig. 3 and [0006], [0083]; virtual book 24), said handbook including a left page, a right page, and at least one binder ring interconnecting the left page to the right page (e.g., see Fig. 3 and [0012], [0083]; virtual book having virtual left and right pages 26, 27 and can be bound together by a virtual ring binder as disclosed in [0121] and [0124]);

(b) displaying a page in said handbook on said display screen of said machine in response to an input instruction (e.g., see Figs. 3, 4 and [0083]; the virtual book can be opened to show pages 26, 27, which can be turned); and

(c) determining said data from said page in said handbook being displayed on said display screen of said machine in response to a set of input data and a further set of data stored in a database (e.g., see Fig. 6 and [0096]-[0098]; user can select books from the virtual bookstore to view), said data determined during the determining step (c) being displayed on said display screen of said machine (e.g., see Figs. 6, 7 and [0096]; the ordered or downloaded book is displayed).

As to claims 5, 24, and 43, Anderson further teaches enabling a search window on said computer display screen (e.g., see Figs. 6, 7 and [0097]; search function); entering search

parameters in said search window (e.g., see Figs. 6-7); and displaying said data in response to the step of entering said search parameters (e.g., see Fig. 26 and [0128]; suggested books are displayed).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 2, 3, 21, 22, 40, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of AmericanTurbine (captured images from americanturbine web pages, published 2001, pages 1-6; hereinafter AmericanTurbine).**

As to claims 2, 21, and 40, Anderson teaches the limitation of claims 1, 20, and 39 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 20, and 39 above. Anderson does not expressly teach: entering a first unit in a first databox on said page in said handbook being displayed on said computer display screen and converting said first unit to a second unit, said second unit being displayed in a second databox on said page in said handbook being displayed on said computer display screen.

AmericanTurbine teaches a web page displayed on a computer display screen including entering a first unit in a first databox on said page and converting said first unit to a second unit (e.g., see pages 1-4; Unit converter that allows a user to enter an amount in the left blank textbox to convert to a second unit), said second unit being displayed in a second databox on

Art Unit: 2179

said page being displayed on said computer display screen (e.g., see pages 1-4; the converted result will be displayed in the right textbox)

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the book graphical user interface as taught by Anderson to include the web-based unit conversion calculator as taught by AmericanTurbine to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide a user-friendly user interface that is accessible anywhere there is internet connection.

As to claims 3, 22, and 41, Anderson teaches the limitation of claims 1, 20, and 39 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 20, and 39 above. Anderson does not expressly teach entering one or more pump parameters in one or more databoxes on said page in said handbook being displayed on said computer display screen and calculating pump related data in response to said pump parameters, said pump related data being displayed in one or more additional databoxes on said page in said handbook being displayed on said computer display screen.

AmericanTurbine teaches entering one or more pump parameters in one or more databoxes on said page displayed on said computer display screen (e.g., see pages 5-6; calculating Pressure Head or Field Head by entering values in the provided fields); and

calculating pump related data in response to said pump parameters (e.g., see pages 5-6; clicking 'Calculate' button), said pump related data being displayed in one or more additional databoxes on said page displayed on said computer display screen (e.g., pump resulted data is displayed in the input field next to 'Calculate' button; note that the pump related data calculator is displayed on a web page on a computer display screen). Thus, combining Anderson and AmericanTurbine would meet the claimed limitation for the same reason as discussed in claims 2, 21, and 40.

9. Claims 4, 23, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of AquaDyn (captured images from aquadyntech website, published 02-2002, pages 1-4; hereinafter AquaDyn).

As to claims 4, 23, and 42, Anderson teaches the limitation of claims 1, 20, and 39 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 20, and 39 above. Anderson does not expressly teach entering one or more tank dimensions in one or more databoxes on said page in said handbook being displayed on said computer displayed screen and calculating tank related data in response to said tank dimensions, said tank related data being displayed in one or more additional databoxes on said page in said handbook being displayed on said computer display screen.

AquaDyn teaches entering one or more tank dimensions in one or more databoxes on said page being displayed on said computer display screen (e.g., see page1; entering tank's length, width and depth into allotted input fields); and calculating tank related data in response to said tank dimensions (e.g., see page1; calculating tank related data in response to entered tank data), said tank related data being displayed in one or more additional databoxes on said page being displayed on said computer display screen (e.g., displaying results in one or more units such as Cubic Feet or Gallons in the associated textfields as shown in page 3).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the book graphical user interface as taught by Anderson to display the web-based tank calculator as taught by AquaDyn to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide a user-friendly user interface with tank calculating function that is accessible anywhere there is internet connection.

10. Claims 6, 25, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Bowden (pub. No. US 20030074284 A1; hereinafter Bowden).

As to claims 6, 25, and 44, Anderson teaches the limitation of claims 5, 24, and 43 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 5, 24, and 43 above. Anderson does not expressly teach said data comprises a plurality of suppliers and a corresponding plurality of brand names associated with tubular goods adapted to be disposed in a wellbore.

Bowden teaches a tubular information management system having data comprise a plurality of suppliers (e.g., see [0060]; wherein data can be retrieved based on vendor codes) and a corresponding plurality of brand names associated with tubular goods adapted to be disposed in a wellbore (e.g., see Fig. 3 and [0070]; tubular goods can be retrieved based on remanufacturer; note: tubular goods are used for drilling activities – interpreting as wellbore, see [0007]).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the book graphical user interface as taught by Anderson to provide a tubular information management system as taught by Bowden to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide a user-friendly user interface with an effective control of the management process of materials for oil field country tubular goods.

11. Claims 7, 26, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of pipe efunda (pipe pressure loss calculator, screen captured pages 1-4, published 02-2002; hereinafter efunda).

As to claims 7, 26, and 45, Anderson teaches the limitation of claims 1, 20, and 39 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 20, and 39 above. Anderson does not

expressly teach entering into said page in data pertaining to one of a length of pipe or an effective stretch of said pipe in one or more databoxes being displayed on said computer display screen; and calculating data pertaining to an alternative of said length of pipe or said effective stretch of said pipe, said alternative of said length of pipe or said effective stretch of said pipe being displayed in one or more additional databoxes on said page being displayed on said computer display screen.

efunda teaches entering into said page in data pertaining to one of a length of pipe or an effective stretch of said pipe in one or more databoxes being displayed on said computer display screen (e.g., see page1; entering pipe length from A to B, L); and calculating data pertaining to the other of said length of pipe or said effective stretch of said pipe (e.g., data is calculating in response to the user clicking on Calculate button, see page 2), said other of said length of pipe or said effective stretch of said pipe being displayed in one or more additional databoxes on said page being displayed on said computer display screen (e.g., data related to the pipe's entered data is displayed in the Answers fields as shown in page 2).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the book graphical user interface as taught by Anderson to display the web-based pipe calculator as taught by efunda to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide a user-friendly user interface with pipe calculating function that is accessible anywhere there is internet connection.

12. Claims 8-17, 27-36, and 46-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of AmericanTurbine further in view of the applicant's admitted prior art of "Hand held handbook".

As to claims 8, 27, and 46, Anderson teaches the limitation of claims 1, 20, and 39 for the reasons as discussed with respect to claims 1, 20, and 39 above. Anderson does not

expressly teach determining said data from said page in said handbook being displayed on said computer display screen comprises the steps of: locating an outer diameter and a weight and an inner diameter of a tubing on said page in said handbook being displayed on said computer display screen; and determining a capacity and a displacement of said tubing on said page in said handbook being displayed on said computer display screen.

AmericanTurbine teaches a calculator for pump engineering related data comprising databoxes for the user to locate data to be calculated (e.g., see pages 5-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to have included a calculator feature as taught by AmericanTurbine in the book graphical user interface as taught by Anderson to achieve the user friendly calculator that is easily accessible anywhere there is internet connection.

AmericanTurbine and Anderson do not teach the calculator book graphical user interface is for determining a capacity and a displacement of the tubing. The examiner takes Official Notice that the formulas for determining a capacity and a displacement of the tubing are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., see [0003], [0004]; wherein Hand held handbook containing relevant field data used in the water and gas industry). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the calculator feature of the book graphical user interface as suggested by AmericanTurbine and Anderson to include the feature of calculating a capacity and a displacement of the tubing based on outer diameter, weight and inner diameter of a tubing based on the well-known formulas to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is to provide a user friendly user interface that is easy to access to calculate relevant field data.

As to claims 9, 28, and 47, Anderson and AmericanTurbine teach the book graphical user interface that has calculator feature as set forth in the rejection of claims 8, 27 and 46 above. Anderson and AmericanTurbine do not teach entering into said page in said handbook a set of dimensions associated with an inner tubing and an outer tubing or casing in a wellbore; and calculating said data in response to said set of dimensions, said data including one or more of a volume for a unit length, a metal displacement of the outer tubing or casing, a metal displacement of the inner tubing, a volume for a given depth, and a depth for a given volume, said data being displayed on said computer display screen.

The examiner, however, takes Official Notice that the formulas for calculating volume of a unit length, a metal displacement of the outer tubing or casing, a metal displacement of the inner tubing, a volume for a given depth, and a depth for a given volume are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., see [0003], [0004]; wherein Hand held handbook containing relevant field data used in the water and gas industry). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the calculator feature of the book graphical user interface as suggested by AmericanTurbine and Anderson to include the feature of calculating volume of a unit length, a metal displacement of the outer tubing or casing, a metal displacement of the inner tubing, a volume for a given depth, and a depth for a given volume based on dimensions of inner tubing and outer tubing or casing in a wellbore based on the well-known formulas to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is for the same reason as set forth in claim 8 above.

As to claims 10, 29, and 48, Anderson and AmericanTurbine teach the book graphical user interface that has calculator feature as set forth in the rejection of claims 8, 27 and 46 above. Anderson and AmericanTurbine do not teach entering into said page in said handbook a

proppant concentration and water density value into said computer; obtaining into said page in said handbook a specific gravity of said proppant from a database of said computer; and calculating a density of a resultant slurry in response to said proppant concentration and water density value and said specific gravity of said proppant, said density of said resultant slurry being displayed on said computer display screen.

The examiner, however, takes Official Notice that the formulas for calculating a density of a resultant slurry based on proppant concentration, water density value and gravity of the proppant are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., see [0003], [0004]; wherein Hand held handbook containing relevant field data used in the water and gas industry). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the calculator feature of the book graphical user interface as suggested by AmericanTurbine and Anderson to include the feature of calculating a density of a resultant slurry based on proppant concentration, water density value and gravity of the proppant based on the well-known formulas to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is for the same reason as set forth in claim 8 above.

As to claims 11, 30, and 49, Anderson and AmericanTurbine teach the book graphical user interface that has calculator feature as set forth in the rejection of claims 8, 27 and 46 above. Anderson and AmericanTurbine do not teach entering into said page in said handbook a proppant type and a pump schedule into said computer; determining a set of properties of said proppant from a database in said computer; and calculating a gate percentage opening in response to the set of properties of said proppant and said pump schedule, said gate percentage opening being displayed on said computer display screen.

The examiner, however, takes Official Notice that the formulas or procedures for calculating a gate percentage opening based on the set of properties of the proppant and the

pump schedule are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., see [0003], [0004]; wherein Hand held handbook containing relevant field data used in the water and gas industry). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the calculator feature of the book graphical user interface as suggested by AmericanTurbine and Anderson to include the feature of calculating a gate percentage opening in response to the set of properties of said proppant and said pump schedule based on the well-known formulas to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is for the same reason as set forth in claim 8 above.

As to claims 12, 31, and 50, Anderson and AmericanTurbine teach the book graphical user interface that has calculator feature as set forth in the rejection of claims 8, 27 and 46 above. Anderson and AmericanTurbine do not teach entering into said page in said handbook properties of a proppant into said computer; entering into said page in said handbook a configuration of a wellbore; and calculating an amount of said proppant remaining in a tubular in said wellbore, said amount of said proppant remaining in a tubular being displayed on said computer display screen.

The examiner, however, takes Official Notice that the formulas or procedures for calculating an amount of the proppant remaining in a tubular in the wellbore are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., see [0003], [0004]; wherein Hand held handbook containing relevant field data used in the water and gas industry). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the calculator feature of the book graphical user interface as suggested by AmericanTurbine and Anderson to include the feature of calculating an amount of said proppant remaining in a tubular in said wellbore in response to the entering the configuration of a wellbore

based on the well-known formulas to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is for the same reason as set forth in claim 8 above.

As to claims 13, 32, and 51, Anderson and AmericanTurbine teach the book graphical user interface that has calculator feature as set forth in the rejection of claims 8, 27 and 46 above. Anderson and AmericanTurbine do not teach (a) entering into said page in said handbook data relating to a construction of a cement blend; (b) selecting a proper blend used during the calculating step (e), the selecting step (b) including selecting said cement blend of step (a) or selecting a neat cement; (c) selecting additives to be added to the blend; and (d) determining a description of slurry, the step of determining said description of said slurry including, (e) calculating one or more of slurry yield, mix water requirements, base fluid requirements, and mix fluid values, said description of said slurry being displayed on said computer display screen.

The examiner, however, takes Official Notice that the formulas or procedures for calculating one or more of slurry yield, mix water requirements, base fluid requirements, and mix fluid values are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., see [0003], [0004]; wherein Hand held handbook containing relevant field data used in the water and gas industry). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the calculator feature of the book graphical user interface as suggested by AmericanTurbine and Anderson to include the feature of calculating one or more of slurry yield, mix water requirements, base fluid requirements, and mix fluid values based on the well-known formulas to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is for the same reason as set forth in claim 8 above.

As to claims 14, 33, and 52, Anderson and AmericanTurbine teach the book graphical user interface that has calculator feature as set forth in the rejection of claims 8, 27 and 46 above. Anderson and AmericanTurbine do not teach entering into said page in said handbook values relating to a casing diameter associated with a casing in a wellbore, a weight of said casing, and a depth of said casing; and determining, in response to the entering step, if a pumping pressure at a surface of said wellbore will cause said casing to unseat and further determining a critical surface pressure above which said casing will unseat, said critical surface pressure being displayed on said computer display screen.

The examiner, however, takes Official Notice that the formulas or procedures for determining if a pumping pressure at a surface of said wellbore will cause said casing to unseat and further determining a critical surface pressure above which said casing will unseat are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., see [0003], [0004]; wherein Hand held handbook containing relevant field data used in the water and gas industry). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the calculator feature of the book graphical user interface as suggested by AmericanTurbine and Anderson to include the feature of determining, in response to the entering step, if a pumping pressure at a surface of said wellbore will cause said casing to unseat and further determining a critical surface pressure above which said casing will unseat based on the well-known procedures or formulas to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is for the same reason as set forth in claim 8 above.

As to claims 15, 34, and 53, Anderson and AmericanTurbine teach the book graphical user interface that has calculator feature as set forth in the rejection of claims 8, 27 and 46 above. Anderson and AmericanTurbine do not teach entering into said page in said handbook a Hydrochloric Acid (HCL) concentration, and determining, from said HCL concentration, a

specific gravity of said HCL and a density of said HCL, said specific gravity and said density being displayed on said computer display screen.

The examiner, however, takes Official Notice that the formulas or procedures for determining, from a HCL concentration, a specific gravity of said HCL and a density of the HCL are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., see [0003], [0004]; wherein Hand held handbook containing relevant field data used in the water and gas industry). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the calculator feature of the book graphical user interface as suggested by AmericanTurbine and Anderson to include the feature of determining determining, from said HCL concentration, a specific gravity of said HCL and a density of said HCL based on the well-known procedures or formulas to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is for the same reason as set forth in claim 8 above.

As to claims 16, 35, and 54, Anderson and AmericanTurbine teach the book graphical user interface that has calculator feature as set forth in the rejection of claims 8, 27 and 46 above. Anderson and AmericanTurbine do not teach entering into said page in said handbook one of an API oil gravity value and a specific gravity of oil value, and calculating the other of said API oil gravity value and said specific gravity of oil value, said other of said API oil gravity value and said specific gravity of oil value being displayed on said computer display screen.

The examiner, however, takes Official Notice that the formulas or procedures for calculating the other of said American Petroleum Institute (API) oil gravity value and said specific gravity of oil value are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., see [0003], [0004]; wherein Hand held handbook containing relevant field data used in the water and gas industry). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to have modified the calculator feature of the book graphical user interface as suggested by AmericanTurbine and Anderson to include the feature of calculating the other of said API oil gravity value and said specific gravity of oil value based on the well-known procedures or formulas to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is for the same reason as set forth in claim 8 above.

As to claims 17, 36, and 55, Anderson and AmericanTurbine teach the book graphical user interface that has calculator feature as set forth in the rejection of claims 8, 27 and 46 above. Anderson and AmericanTurbine do not teach selecting from said page in said handbook a desired amount of salt from a particular weight of solution on said page in said handbook on the condition that said particular weight of solution is located on said page in said handbook; locating on said page in said handbook a first weight of solution associated with a first amount of salt and a second weight of solution associated with a second amount of salt, where said first weight of solution is greater than said particular weight of solution and said second weight of solution is less than said particular weight of solution, and interpolating between the first and second different weights of solution to determine said desired amount of said salt having a value which lies between the first and second amounts of salt on the condition that said particular weight of solution is not located on said page in said handbook; and displaying said desired amount of said salt on said computer display screen.

The examiner, however, takes Official Notice that the formulas or procedures for determining a desired amount of salt based on weight of solution are well-known in the art at the time the invention was made (e.g., see [0003], [0004]; wherein Hand held handbook containing relevant field data used in the water and gas industry). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the calculator feature of the book graphical user interface as suggested by AmericanTurbine and

Anderson to include the feature of determining said desired amount of said salt having a value which lies between the first and second amounts of salt on the condition that said particular weight of solution to achieve the claim invention. One would be motivated to make such a combination is for the same reason as set forth in claim 8 above.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 4/12/10 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

- ♦ The applicant argues that the prior art of Randall does not describe a handbook including a left page, a right page, and at least one binder ring interconnecting the left page to the right page (e.g., see remark 18, paragraph 5).

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in Figs. 3a-4 and col. 3 lines 19-26, Randall teaches a graphical user interface having a handbook like display including a plurality of pages displayed on both left and right side; the pages are shown as interconnected by a virtual ring binders and pages can be depicted as turning over. For clarity, Figure 4 from Randall reference is reproduced as bellows:

As seen below, the handbook graphical user interface of Randall clearly shows a handbook with a left page, a right page and at least one binder ring interconnecting the pages together.

For at least this reason, the examiner concludes that Randall teaches claims 1, 5, 20, 24, 39 and 43 as rejected supra.




FIG. 4.


- ♦ The applicant argues that the prior art of Anderson does not describe a handbook including a left page, a right page, and at least one binder ring interconnecting the left page to the right page (e.g., see remark 18, paragraph 6).

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in Fig. 3a and [0012], [0083], [0121], [0124], Anderson teaches a virtual book graphical user interface including left page, a right page, and at least one binder ring interconnecting the left page to the right page. For clarity, Figure 3 from Anderson reference is reproduced as follows:

Similar to that of Randall reference, Anderson shows a graphical user interface having a handbook display including a left page, a right page and at least one binder ring interconnecting the left page to the right page. Anderson explicitly discloses that the binder that connects the pages together is a ring binder (e.g., see [0121]). Anderson teaches the virtual book can be opened to show pages which can be turned over to other page in response to user input (e.g., see Figs. 3, 4 and [0083]). Anderson teaches the virtual book user interface can be used to

Art Unit: 2179

search for data stored in the database (e.g., see Figs. 6, 7 and [0096]-[098]). Accordingly, the examiner concludes that Anderson teaches the argued limitation.



- ♦ The applicant argues that the motivation to combine the references is not supported by a reference or more substantive analysis (e.g., see Remark 19).

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that KSR forecloses Applicant's argument that a specific teaching is required for a finding of obviousness. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1741, 82 USPQ2d at 1396. In this case, the examiner has followed the basic factual inquires of *Graham v. John Deere* and herein incorporate the rejection addressed *supra*.

- ♦ The well-known in the art statement asserted in pages 12-19 of the Office Action mailed 01/12/2010 is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice (see MPEP 2144.03).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TuyetLien T Tran/
Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179